The physical gravitational degrees of freedom

E. Anderson,[1,2,3,4,*] J. Barbour,[5,†] B.Z. Foster,[6,‡] B. Kelleher,[7,8,§] and N. Ó Murchadha[7,¶]

[1]*Astronomy Unit, School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, London, E1 4NS, UK*
[2]*Department of Physics, P-412 Avadh Bhatia Physics Laboratory, University of Alberta, Edmonton Canada*
[3]*Peterhouse, Cambridge CB2 1RD, UK*
[4]*DAMTP, Centre for Mathemetical Sciences, Wilberforce Road Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK*
[5]*College Farm, South Newington, Banbury 0X15 4JG, UK*
[6]*Physics Department, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA*
[7]*Physics Department, University College Cork, Ireland*
[8]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada*

(Dated: February 3, 2008)

When constructing general relativity (GR), Einstein required 4D general covariance. In contrast, we derive GR (in the compact, without boundary case) as a theory of evolving 3-dimensional conformal Riemannian geometries obtained by imposing two general principles: 1) time is derived from change; 2) motion and size are relative. We write down an explicit action based on them. We obtain not only GR in the CMC gauge, in its Hamiltonian 3 + 1 reformulation but also all the equations used in York's conformal technique for solving the initial-value problem. This shows that the independent gravitational degrees of freedom obtained by York do not arise from a gauge fixing but from hitherto unrecognized fundamental symmetry principles. They can therefore be identified as the long-sought Hamiltonian physical gravitational degrees of freedom.

PACS numbers: 04.20.Cv, 04.20.Fy

arXiv:gr-qc/0407104v2 9 Aug 2005

Since Einstein created GR 4D spacetime covariance has been taken as its axiomatic basis. However, much work has been done in a dynamical approach that uses the 3+1 split into space and time of Arnowitt, Deser, and Misner (ADM)[1]. This work has been stimulated by the needs of astrophysics (especially gravitational-wave research) and by the desire to find a canonical version of GR suitable for quantization.

The ADM formalism describes constrained Hamiltonian evolution of 3D spacelike hypersurfaces embedded in 4D spacetime. The intrinsic geometry of the hypersurfaces is represented by a Riemannian 3-metric g_{ij}, which is the ADM canonical coordinate. The corresponding canonical momentum π^{ij} is related to the extrinsic curvature κ^{ij} of the embedding of the hypersurfaces in spacetime by $\pi^{ij} = -\sqrt{g}(\kappa^{ij} - g^{ij}\kappa)$.

The ADM dynamics, which respects full relativity of simultaneity by allowing free choice of the 3+1 split, is driven by two constraints. The linear *momentum constraint* $\pi^{ij}{}_{;j} = 0$ reflects the gauge symmetry under 3D diffeomorphisms and is well understood. When it has been quotiented out, the 3×3 symmetric matrix g_{ij} has three degrees of freedom. The quadratic *Hamiltonian constraint* $gH = -\pi^{ij}\pi_{ij} + \pi^2/2 + gR = 0$ reflects the relativity of simultaneity – the time coordinate can be freely chosen at each space point. It shows that g_{ij} has only two physical degrees of freedom. The problem is to find them. The solution, if it exists, will break 4D covariance.

An important clue was obtained by York [2], who perfected Lichnerowicz's conformal technique [3] for finding initial data that satisfy the initial-value constraints of GR. In the Hamiltonian formalism, these are the ADM Hamiltonian and momentum constraints. Finding such data is far from trivial. York's is the only known effective method. He divides the 6 degrees of freedom in the 3-metric into three groups; 3 are mere coordinate freedoms, 1 is a scale part (a conformal factor), and the two remaining parts represent the conformal geometry, the 'shape of space'. York's method also introduces a distinguished foliation of spacetime – and with it a definition of simultaneity – by hypersurfaces of constant mean (extrinsic) curvature (CMC).

Based on his success, York concluded that the two conformal degrees of freedom at each space point do represent the gravitational degrees of freedom. If space is compact without boundary (CWB), the local shapes interact with a solitary global variable – the changing value of the CMC. However, the view that the local shapes are the true degrees of freedom has not been widely accepted. This is probably because York's method has not hitherto been derived from a physical first principle but on the basis of a mathematical condition: conformally invariant decoupling of the

*Electronic address: ea212@hermes.cam.ac.uk
†Electronic address: julian@platonia.com
‡Electronic address: bzf@physics.umd.edu
§Electronic address: kelleher@physics.ubc.ca
¶Electronic address: niall@ucc.ie

momentum and Hamiltonian constraints. If one is to break the gauge symmetry of 4D covariance to obtain true gravitational degrees of freedom, a plausible alternative gauge symmetry must be found and used to derive York's method.

We show that it is relativity of scale (size). Adopting it in conjunction with the principles that time is derived from change and that motion is relative, we recover the ADM Hamiltonian formalism but with York's distinguished CMC foliation and all the equations of his method. We give a physical explanation for the success of his method. His physical degrees of freedom are unambiguously identified.

The configuration space on which we work is defined by successive quotienting. The space of suitably continuous Riemannian 3-metrics g_{ij} on a CWB 3-manifold is Riem. Its quotient wrt 3D diffeomorphisms is *superspace*. The quotient of superspace wrt 3D conformal transformations $g_{ij} \to \phi^4 g_{ij}$ is *conformal superspace* (CS) [4], which York uses to parametrize initial data that satisfy the ADM constraints. We define our theory on the marginally larger space CS+V obtained by quotienting superspace wrt *volume-preserving* 3D conformal transformations. The infinitely many local scales are all relative but the overall scale is absolute. This weak relaxation of full scale invariance means that the changing total volume of space (the Lagrangian counterpart of York's momentum-like CMC value) is one extra degree of freedom along with the pure shape variables. It allows expansion of the universe.

To implement our Principle 1, i.e., that time is derived from change, we construct on CS+V a theory of 'timeless geodesics', parametrized by a freely chosen label λ. Local proper time is emergent in this approach. Our Principle 2, i.e., that motion and size are relative, is implemented by invariance under λ-dependent 3D diffeomorphisms and volume-preserving conformal transformations.

We achieve our aims by modifying the Baierlein–Sharp–Wheeler (BSW) [5] form of the GR action:

$$I_{\rm BSW} = \int {\rm d}\lambda \mathcal{L}_{\rm BSW} = \int {\rm d}\lambda {\rm d}^3x \sqrt{g}\sqrt{R}\sqrt{T}, \tag{1}$$

where $g = \det(g_{ij})$, R is the 3-d scalar curvature, and

$$T = G^{ijkl}\frac{dg_{ij}}{d\lambda}\frac{dg_{kl}}{d\lambda} \equiv G^{ijkl}(\dot{g}_{ij} - \pounds_\xi g_{ij})(\dot{g}_{kl} - \pounds_\xi g_{kl}). \tag{2}$$

Here $G^{ijkl} \equiv (g^{ik}g^{jl} - g^{ij}g^{kl})$ is the inverse DeWitt supermetric, and $\pounds_\xi g_{ij} = \nabla_i\xi_j + \nabla_j\xi_i$ is the Lie derivative of the metric with respect to ξ^i. This action is invariant under local reparametrization of λ, satisfying Principle 1. The emergent proper time t is related to the label λ by $\delta t = N\delta\lambda$, for $N \equiv \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{T/R}$. ξ_i is effectively a gauge auxiliary that renders the action invariant under 3-diffeomorphisms, satisfying the 'motion is relative' part of Principle 2.

The BSW action is defined on curves in superspace. We considered generalizations of this action in [6]. As this led us almost uniquely back to the BSW action, it is a new derivation of GR. In [7], we extended the BSW action to CS, satisfying our new (in gravitational theory) 'size is relative' principle. While this led to a consistent theory, it is not GR. Interestingly, in the asymptotically flat case, BSW on CS does generate GR, in the maximal guage. Here, we extend the BSW action only to CS+V. The volume-preserving restriction allows us to recover GR in the York picture.

We will denote a volume-preserving conformal transformation (VPCT) with a 'hat':

$$g_{ij}(x) \to \widehat{\omega}(x)^4 g_{ij}(x). \tag{3}$$

One can construct a VPCT $\widehat{\omega}$ from any unrestricted conformal transformation ω:

$$\widehat{\omega} = \frac{\omega}{<\omega^6>^{1/6}}, \tag{4}$$

where

$$<F> = \frac{\int {\rm d}^3x\sqrt{g}\,F}{\int {\rm d}^3x\sqrt{g}}, \tag{5}$$

denotes the global average of some function F. One can express any VPCT $\widehat{\omega}$ in this manner.

We implement the conformal symmetry in the BSW action (1) by introducing an auxiliary scalar field ϕ, constructing from it in the manner above the field $\widehat{\phi}$. Under a VPCT (4), we declare that $\widehat{\phi}$ transforms as

$$\widehat{\phi} \to \frac{\widehat{\phi}}{\widehat{\omega}}. \tag{6}$$

Consequently, the 'corrected coordinates' $\overline{g}_{ij} \equiv \widehat{\phi}^4 g_{ij}$ are invariant under a VPCT. We then re-express the BSW action in terms of $\overline{g}_{ij}$, obtaining an action functional in g_{ij} and ϕ. We vary ϕ freely, not $\widehat{\phi}$.

On the introduction of the auxiliary variable ϕ, the constituent parts of the BSW action become

$$R \to \widehat{\phi}^{-4}\left(R - 8\frac{\nabla^2\widehat{\phi}}{\widehat{\phi}}\right), \qquad T \to \widehat{T} = \widehat{\phi}^{-8}G^{ijkl}\frac{d\widehat{\phi}^4 g_{ij}}{d\lambda}\frac{d\widehat{\phi}^4 g_{kl}}{d\lambda}, \tag{7}$$

with

$$\frac{d\widehat{\phi}^4 g_{ij}}{d\lambda} = \widehat{\phi}^4\left[\dot{g}_{ij} - \pounds_\xi g_{ij} + \frac{4}{\widehat{\phi}}(\dot{\widehat{\phi}} - \pounds_\xi\widehat{\phi})g_{ij}\right]. \tag{8}$$

The action (1) becomes

$$I_{\mathrm{CS+V}} = \int \mathrm{d}\lambda \int \mathrm{d}^3x\sqrt{g}\,\widehat{\phi}^4\sqrt{R - 8\frac{\nabla^2\widehat{\phi}}{\widehat{\phi}}}\sqrt{\widehat{T}}. \tag{9}$$

We now explain the rules by which we vary the action. A curve through the configuration space specifies a sequence $g_{ij}(\lambda)$ through Riem, combined with a λ-dependent conformal factor $\widehat{\phi}(\lambda)$ and a λ-dependent coordinate transformation $\chi_i(\lambda)$ (for which $\xi_i = \partial\chi_i/\partial\lambda$). We identify ϕ and χ_i as gauge variables, so they need not reduce to the identity at the end points of the curve. Therefore, we extremize the action under fixed-end-point variations of g_{ij} and free-end-point variations of ϕ and χ_i.

We now illustrate free-end-point variation in a simple scale-invariant N-particle model [8]. The corrected coordinates are $\tilde{q}_{(i)} = aq_{(i)}$ and the corrected velocities are $\dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)} = \dot{a}q_{(i)} + a\dot{q}_{(i)}$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{q}_{(i)}, \dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)})$. Here a is the scaling auxiliary and $q_{(i)}$ are the Cartesian coordinates of unit-mass point particles. The single auxiliary a matches the single scaling degeneracy of the $q_{(i)}$. It doubles the degeneracy. The habitual pairing of $q_{(i)}$ and a has several consequences, including full gauge invariance of all the theory's equations, as we shall show elsewhere. More importantly, it imposes constraints. Indeed, the canonical momenta, $p^{(i)} = \partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\dot{q}_i$ and $p^a = \partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\dot{a}$, are

$$p^{(i)} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)}}\frac{\partial\dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)}}{\partial\dot{q}_{(i)}} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)}}a, \qquad p^a = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)}}\frac{\partial\dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)}}{\partial\dot{a}} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\tilde{q}}_{(i)}}q_{(i)}. \tag{10}$$

We therefore have the *primary constraint* [9]

$$q_{(i)}p^{(i)} \equiv ap^a. \tag{11}$$

The variation $\int \mathrm{d}\lambda(\delta\mathcal{L}/\delta a)\delta a$ is

$$\int \mathrm{d}\lambda\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}p^a}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} - \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial a}\right)\delta a + p^a(\delta a)_{\mathrm{final}} - p^a(\delta a)_{\mathrm{initial}}. \tag{12}$$

By the free-end-point rules, this must vanish for any δa. Starting with a general variation that vanishes at the end-points, we deduce the standard Euler–Lagrange equation for a: $\mathrm{d}p^a/\mathrm{d}\lambda = \partial\mathcal{L}/\partial a$. Then, choosing a variation that does not vanish at the initial end-point but does vanish at the final, and enforcing the Euler–Lagrange equations, we deduce that $p^a_{\mathrm{initial}} = 0$. If we then choose a variation that does not vanish at the final end-point, we find that $p^a_{\mathrm{final}} = 0$. As we can freely choose the final point along the curve, we deduce that $p^a = 0$. The Euler-Lagrange equation for a reduces to $\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial a = 0$. This is a key *consistency condition*. Hence, one can effectively minimize the action with respect to a and $\dot{a}$ independently, although the conditions really arise from a free-end-point variation of a. Finally, we get a *secondary constraint* $q_{(i)}p^{(i)} = 0$ from the primary constraint. These simple considerations capture all the novel features of our theory.

We may now proceed to apply this variational procedure to the conformalized BSW action (9). However, we need one computation. We know

$$\widehat{\phi} = \frac{\phi[\int\sqrt{g}d^3x]^{\frac{1}{6}}}{[\int\phi^6\sqrt{g}d^3x]^{\frac{1}{6}}}. \tag{13}$$

Therefore

$$\dot{\widehat{\phi}} = \frac{\widehat{\phi}\dot{\phi}}{\phi} - \frac{\widehat{\phi}\int\widehat{\phi}^6\frac{\dot{\phi}}{\phi}\sqrt{g}d^3x}{\int\sqrt{g}d^3x} + \frac{\widehat{\phi}}{12}\frac{\int(1-\widehat{\phi}^6)g^{ab}\dot{g}_{ab}\sqrt{g}d^3x}{\int\sqrt{g}d^3x}. \tag{14}$$

Now, variation with respect to $\dot{g}_{ij}$ defines the canonical momenta π^{ij}:

$$\pi^{ij} \equiv \frac{\delta I}{\delta \dot{g}_{ij}} = \Pi^{ij} + \frac{<\tilde{\Pi}>}{3}\sqrt{g}\, g^{ij}(1-\widehat{\phi}^6), \tag{15}$$

where

$$\Pi^{ij} = \frac{\widehat{\phi}^2\sqrt{g}}{2N}G^{ijkl}\frac{d\widehat{\phi}^4 g_{kl}}{d\lambda}, \qquad N \equiv \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\widehat{T}}{\widehat{\phi}^{-4}(R-8\frac{\nabla^2\phi}{\phi})}}, \tag{16}$$

and $\Pi = \sqrt{g}\,\tilde{\Pi} = g_{ij}\Pi^{ij}$. Variation wrt $\dot{\phi}$ gives

$$p_\phi \equiv \frac{\delta I}{\delta \dot{\phi}} = \frac{4}{\phi}(\Pi - \sqrt{g}\,\widehat{\phi}^6 <\tilde{\Pi}>). \tag{17}$$

The 'bulk' terms in Eqn.(15) and Eqn.(17) come from the second and third terms in Eqn.(14). These definitions imply a primary constraint:

$$p_\phi = \frac{4}{\phi}(\pi - \sqrt{g} < p >), \tag{18}$$

where $\pi = \sqrt{g}p = g_{ij}\pi^{ij}$. Also, the rules of free-end-point variation imply that $p_\phi = 0$. Hence we find the secondary constraint

$$p = C, \tag{19}$$

where C is some spatial (ie λ-dependent) constant. This constraint is equivalent to the CMC condition imposed by York, obtained here as a genuine constraint and not a gauge-fixing condition (a similar result appeared earlier in [7]). As this condition designates a preferred time-function, it introduces a notion of global simultaneity. This also means that our theory is restricted to those solutions of the Einstein equations which possess a CMC slice.

Taking the trace of Eqn.(15)

$$\pi = \Pi + <\tilde{\Pi}>\sqrt{g}(1-\widehat{\phi}^6), \tag{20}$$

and integrating gives

$$<p> = <\tilde{\Pi}> = C. \tag{21}$$

When this is substituted back into Eqn.(20), we get

$$g_{ij}\Pi^{ij} = g_{ij}\frac{\widehat{\phi}^2\sqrt{g}}{2N}G^{ijkl}\frac{d\widehat{\phi}^4 g_{kl}}{d\lambda} = C\sqrt{g}\widehat{\phi}^6, \tag{22}$$

or

$$-\frac{\widehat{\phi}^{-4}g^{kl}}{N}\frac{d\widehat{\phi}^4 g_{kl}}{d\lambda} = C. \tag{23}$$

This shows how C must be a VPCT (4) invariant. Such invariance is a key part of the York construction.

The reparametrization-invariant momenta satisfy an identity analogous to the ADM Hamiltonian constraint:

$$\pi^{ij}\pi_{ij} - \frac{\pi^2}{2} - \frac{gC^2}{6}(1-\widehat{\phi}^6)^2 + \frac{C}{3}\sqrt{g}\pi(1-\widehat{\phi}^6) = g\widehat{\phi}^8\left(R - 8\frac{\nabla^2\phi}{\phi}\right). \tag{24}$$

If we define $\sigma^{ij} \equiv \pi^{ij} - \frac{1}{3}g^{ij}\pi$ and enforce the CMC constraint (19), then (24) becomes the identity

$$\sigma^{ij}\sigma_{ij} - \frac{\pi^2\widehat{\phi}^{12}}{6} - g\widehat{\phi}^8\left(R - 8\frac{\nabla^2\widehat{\phi}}{\widehat{\phi}}\right) = 0. \tag{25}$$

It holds on any path in the configuration space. In the Hamiltonian picture, in which π^{ij} are independent variables, it becomes a constraint. It is in fact the *Lichnerowicz–York equation* [2]. Note that the conformal weighting of σ^{ij} is exactly as imposed by Lichnerowicz and York.

Varying wrt ξ_i and using (19), we obtain

$$\bigtriangledown_j \pi^{ij} = 0. \tag{26}$$

This is the ADM momentum constraint. In terms of our primary variables, it can be written as

$$\bigtriangledown_j \left[\sqrt{\frac{\widehat{\phi}^{-4}(R - 8\frac{\bigtriangledown^2\phi}{\phi})}{\widehat{T}}} \widehat{\phi}^2 \sqrt{g}(g^{ik}g^{jl} - \frac{1}{3}g^{ij}g^{kl}) \frac{d\widehat{\phi}^4 g_{kl}}{d\lambda} \right] = 0. \tag{27}$$

Varying wrt ϕ leads to the consistency condition

$$N\widehat{\phi}^{-4}\left(R - 8\frac{\bigtriangledown^2\phi}{\phi}\right) - \widehat{\phi}^{-6} \bigtriangledown . \left(\widehat{\phi}^2 \bigtriangledown N\right) + \frac{Np^2}{4} = D, \tag{28}$$

where we have used (19) and

$$D = \left\langle \widehat{\phi}^2 N\left(R - 8\frac{\bigtriangledown^2\phi}{\phi}\right) + \frac{\widehat{\phi}^6 Np^2}{4} \right\rangle; \tag{29}$$

D is the global average of the left-hand side of (28).

We now make a dimensional analysis. We take g_{ij} and ϕ to be dimensionless and give dimensions to the coordinates. We set the speed of light equal to one, so all coordinates have dimensions of length (l). Counting derivatives in their definitions, we find the dimensions of other objects: $[R] = [\widehat{R}] = [\widehat{T}] = 1/l^2$. The lapse, N, is dimensionless. It follows that $[\pi^{ij}] = [\pi] = [p] = [C] = 1/l$. In the York scheme, one fixes an implicit length scale for the CWB manifold by specifying a numerical value for the dimensionful parameter C. That York's scheme determines a physical 3-metric from an initially unphysical one reflects this fixing, as the manifold acquires a volume corresponding to the implicit length scale.

Our approach is complementary to this. We specify as initial data $(g_{ij}, \dot{g}_{ij})$. Our procedure subjects them to considerable 'gauge dressing', but the initial volume V corresponding to the initial g_{ij} is the one thing that must not be changed. We put the scale in explicitly through the canonical coordinate g_{ij}, not though a combination of the canonical momenta. In both cases, giving the numerical value of a single quantity with a length dimension fixes the values of all other quantities with a length dimension. The time label is fixed only up to global reparametrization (as (28) is homogeneous in N), and, as always, the spatial coordinates are freely specifiable.

Our calculations have given us five equations—the CMC condition (23), the momentum constraint (27), and the consistency condition (28)—that we try to solve for the five gauge variables $(\widehat{\phi}, \partial\widehat{\phi}/\partial\lambda, \xi_i)$ given the initial $g_{ij}, \dot{g}_{ij}$. In accordance with our dimensional analysis the constant C, with its dimension l^{-1}, emerges as an eigenvalue for this problem.

There is an easy way of seeing this. Let us consider the three key equations, Eqs.(23), (27), (28), but with the 'hats' removed from the ϕ's. Pick a value of C, and presume that the equations can be solved for the $(\phi, \dot{\phi}, \xi)$. Now consider the following transformation

$$\phi \to \alpha\phi, \quad \dot{\phi} \to \alpha\dot{\phi}, \quad \xi \to \xi, \quad C \to \alpha^{-2}C, \tag{30}$$

where α is any constant. This also generates a solution to the three equations. Now, by choosing $\alpha =< \phi^6 >^{-1/6}$, we can normalize ϕ and thus get the desired solution. In the process we fix the appropriate value of C.

There are many choices of $(g_{ij}, \dot{g}_{ij})$ for which we know solutions exist; e.g. take a CMC slice through a space-time that solves the Einstein equations, take the physical g_{ij} and $\dot{g}_{ij}$ given by the CMC foliation, and multiply by any VPCT. On the other hand, with a given arbitrary $(g_{ij}, \dot{g}_{ij})$, we have no existence theorem for solutions. This problem is very similar to the thin-sandwich problem in GR [5, 11]. As in standard canonical general relativity, the constraints are much easier to solve in the Hamiltonian picture than in the action. The key equation is a slight modification of the standard Lichnerowicz-York equation. It has been shown, [10], that this equation has extremely nice existence and uniqueness properties.

If and when we can solve the equations, we can switch to the 'corrected coordinates' $\overline{g}_{ij}$. In this frame, $\widehat{\phi} = 1$, and the consistency condition (28) reduces to

$$NR - \nabla^2 N + \frac{Np^2}{4} = D. \tag{31}$$

This is the CMC lapse-fixing equation of GR; it ensures propagation of the CMC constraint (19).

York retained the spacetime ontology and used conformally invariant decoupling of the ADM Hamiltonian and momentum constraints as a guiding principle. This led him to regard the Lichnerowicz–York equation as a gauge fixing (see especially his comments near the end of the first paper in [2]). In contrast, our ontology resides in CS+V, and our initial-value problem contains a genuine gauge invariance. This leads to gauge corrections to both g_{ij} and $\dot{g}_{ij}$. Our new principles enable us to derive Hamiltonian GR, the prescription for solving its initial-value problem, and the condition for maintaining the CMC condition in a single package. The details of the transition to the Hamiltonian formulation and the implications of our results will be considered elsewhere.

Three final remarks. First, our work shows that to derive the dynamical core of GR one can use either Einstein's 'relativity of simultaneity' or our 'relativity of local size' but not both at once. The relativity of size approach is clearly very powerful since it yields not only GR but also the method of solving its difficult initial-value problem. Second, our analysis could naturally be called 'the conformal thin-sandwich' approach to GR. Unfortunately, this phrase has already been used [12]. The relationship between the two approaches deserves further investigation. Third, we obtain GR in the CMC gauge. This covers a very large class of solutions of the Einstein equations, but not all, see [13]. This is a problem that will be associated with any gauge-fixing. Whether this is to be regarded as a 'good' or a 'bad' feature of our approach, only time will tell.

Acknowledgments

We dedicate this paper to Jimmy York on the occasion of his 65th birthday. The authors thank him for discussions. EA also thanks Malcolm MacCallum for discussions and PPARC for financial support. EA, BF, BK, and NÓM thank the Barbour family for hospitality. EA acknowledges funding from Peterhouse and from the Killam Foundation, and thanks Queen Mary University of London for Visitor Status. BF was supported in part by the NSF under grant PHYS-0300710 at the University of Maryland and by the CNRS at the Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris. BK thanks Bill Unruh and Johan Brännlund for discussions.

---

[1] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. Misner in *Gravitation: an Introduction to Current Research*, ed. L. Witten, (Wiley, New York, 1962), arXiv:gr-qc/0405109; C. Misner, K. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).
[2] J. W. York, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 1656 (1971); J. W. York, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1082 (1972); J. W. York, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 456 (1973).
[3] A. Lichnerowicz, J. Math. Pures Appl. **23**, 37 (1944).
[4] J. W. York, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré **21**, 319 (1974); A. E. Fischer and V. Moncrief, Gen. Rel. Grav. **28**, 221 (1996).
[5] R. F. Baierlein, D. Sharp and J. A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 1864 (1962).
[6] J. Barbour, B. Z. Foster and N. Ó Murchadha, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 3217 (2002) E. Anderson, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 104001 (2003) E. Anderson, PhD Thesis: *Geometrodynamics: Spacetime or Space?*, Univ. London (2004).
[7] J. Barbour and N. Ó Murchadha, arXiv:gr-qc/9911071; E. Anderson, J. Barbour, B. Foster and N. Ó Murchadha, Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, 1571 (2003) B. Kelleher, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 483 (2004); **21**, 2623 (2004).
[8] J. Barbour, Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, 1543 (2003)
[9] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, (Yeshiva University, New York, 1964).
[10] N. Ó Murchadha, Acta Physica Polonica B, **36**, 109 120 (2005); gr-qc/0502055.
[11] E. P. Belasco and H. C. Ohanian, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 1053 (1969); R. Bartnik and G. Fodor, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 3596 (1993) D. Giulini, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 2470 (1999)
[12] J. W. York, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1350 (1999); H. Pfeiffer and J. W. York, Phys. Rev. **D 67**, 044022 (2003); J. W. York, arXiv:gr-qc//0405005.
[13] R. Bartnik, Comm. Math. Phys. **117**, 615 (1988); D. Eardley and D. Witt, unpublished (1992); P. Chrusciel, J. Isenberg, and D. Pollack, Phys. Rev. Lett., **93**, 081101 (2004).